COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS TOUR

11 June 1986

1. Smithsonian Castle, North Entrance from Jefferson Drive

2. Smithsonian, Museum Building Identification Sign, Mock-Up at 9th and Constitution, N. W.

3. National Sculpture Garden, 8th and Constitution, N. W.

4. Navy Memorial, 8th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.

5. International Center, Reno Road and Van Ness Street, N. W.

6. Tregaron, International School, 3100 Macomb Street, N. W.

7. Georgetown:

    a. Garage, 1609 33rd Street, N. W.

    b. Aramus Project, 1675-79 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W.

    c. 1054 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W.

    d. Potomac Boat Club, 3530 Water Street, (K Street), N. W.

    e. Rosewood 907 30th Street, N. W.

encl: CFA Agenda for June 12 Meeting
Georgetown Board Reports

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

12 June 1986

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of 17 April 1986 minutes.

B. Dates of next meetings:

31 July 1986, 10:00 AM (Thursday)

18 Sept 1986, 10:00 AM (Thursday)

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

CFA 12/JUN/86-7, Gold and Silver Bullion Coins. Report and discussion of designs circulated by request of the Mint.

B. General Services Administration

CFA 12/JUN/86-10, Pennsylvania Avenue at 12th Street, N. W. Report of sub-committee meeting 16 May 1986 and submission of revised design of the Nancy Hanks Memorial, the Old Post Office Plaza.

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 12/JUN/86-1, Pennsylvania Avenue at 8th Street, N. W. Review of full size clay model of Lone Sailor sculpture at the Navy Memorial.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS CONTINUED, 12 June 1986

D. Smithsonian Institution

1. CFA 12/JUN/86-3, Sign program for identification of museum buildings.

2. CFA 12/JUN/86-9, Jefferson Drive, S. W., The Mall. Concept design for new ramp/stair to north entrance of Castle.

E. Department of State, International Center

CFA 12/JUN/86-4, Van Ness and Reno Road, N. W. Concept design alternatives for security-maintenance facility.

F. United States Army

1. CFA 12/JUN/86-5, Arlington Cemetery. Design development for Visitor Center.

2. CFA 12/JUN/86-6, Ft. McNair. Concept design for alternations and addition to Commissary.

G. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 86-80, -99, 3100 Macomb Street, N. W. Concept designs for new academic building and renovation of greenhouse at the International School.

b. S.L. 86-113, 750 17th Street, N. W. Revised design for new office building.

c. Appendix I.

PM 12:30 III. LUNCHEON RECESS

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS CONTINUED, 12 June 1986

PM 1:00 G. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (continued)

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 86-104, and -110, 1054 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W. Proposed razing of existing structures and concept design of replacement building.

b. O.G. 86-149, 907 30th Street, N. W. Final design for public space improvements at the Rosewood Hotel.

c. O.G. 86-153, and -154, 3520 and 3524 Reservoir Road, N. W. Concept design for two new townhouses at The Cloisters.

d. O.G. 86-138, 1609 33rd Street, N. W. Proposed razing of garage.

e. O.G. 86-155, and -156, 1677-79 and 1675 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Alterations, repairs and reconstruction for the Aramus Corporation.

f. O.G. 86-135, 1692 31st Street, N. W. Concept design for alterations and additions to private residence.

g. O.G. 86-152, 3530 Water Street, N. W. Concept design for alteration and addition to Potomac Boat Club.

h. Appendix II.

H. National Park Service, National Capital Region

1. CFA 12/JUN/86-2, Constitution Avenue between 7th and 9th Streets, N. W. Revised pavilion design and concept design for landscaping at the National Sculpture Garden.

2. CFA 12/JUN/86-8, Constitution Avenue at Henry Bacon Drive, N. W. Alteration to area between walkway and base of Wall at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS CONTINUED, 12 June 1986

H. National Park Service, National Capital Region (continued)

3. CFA 12/JUN/86-11, Connecticut Avenue at N Street, N. W. Design for relandscaping of the John Witherspoon Memorial.

IV. INSPECTION

Freer Gallery, review of proposed acquisitions.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-79	400 New Jersey Avenue, N. W. Systems DC Associates (Hyatt Regency)	Pool

ACTION: Issue permit for pool enclosure with exterior brick to match existing building. Working drawings conform to concept approval, S.L. 86-59.

S.L. 86-96	2317 Calvert Street, N. W. Stephen Cohen/Calvert Park Assoc.	Canopy

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for gray canopy.

S.L. 86-97	2042 Pierce Mill Road, N. W. Lawrence Fredette Architect	Renovation

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for porch alteration to match 2044 Pierce Mill Road.

S.L. 86-98	2140 F Street, N. W. John Courembis	Alteration to existing structure:Conceptua

ACTION: No objection to concept of removing front yard slope to create ground floor and secondary entrance. Recommend use of brick for surface material rather than continuation of wood siding for this lower floor. Brick should begin below sill level of existing entrance door. Submit working drawings and brick sample for Commission approval prior to issuance of permit.

S.L. 86-100	900 9th Street, N. W. D. C. Government	Signs

ACTION: Returned to Permit Branch without comment. Site is not in Shipstead-Luce Act area.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-104	2812 Chesterfield Place, N. W. Barbara W. Harrison and Mark F. Corriea	Swimming pool

ACTION: Returned to Permit Branch without comment. Site is not in Shipstead-Luce area.

S.L. 86-103	1227 25th Street, N. W. Vlastimil Koubek	New office building

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for new seven story office building as shown on working drawings received and dated 13 May 1986. Drawings comply with concept design approved by Commission 10 April 1985. Erect sample material panel on site for approval prior to construction of outer walls.

S.L. 86-105	477 H Street, N. W. 477 H Street Associates	Renovation

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed building renovation as shown on working drawings received and dated 21 May 1986.

S.L. 86-107	501 4th Street, S. W. Chevron USA, Inc.	New Chevron sign

ACTION: Submission is not within CFA jurisdiction. Application should be reviewed by DCRLA: Call Stan Sherman 535-1100.

S.L. 86-106	2200 P Street, N. W. Chevron USA, Inc.	New Chevron sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for new Chevron sign which will be mounted in same location and height from ground as existing Gulf sign. Note changes to submitted drawing.

---

12 June 1986

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-109	318 Independence Avenue, S. E. Robert & Diane Hordan	Fence and door

ACTION: Submission is not in jurisdiction of CFA.

S.L. 86-108	1700 H Street, N. W. Metropolitan Club	Squash court addition

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition over existing first floor wing. Working drawings dated 5 June 1986 conform to concept design approved 7 February 1986.

OLD GEORGETOWN ACT SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-119	3050 P Street, N. W. Catharina Biddle	Renovation

ACTION: No objection to issuing permit. Working drawings conform to design given concept approval, O.G. 86-97.

O.G. 86-122	2804 P Street, N. W. Bruce Lehman	Parking area and fence

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for proposed off-alley parking area and new lattice and board fence as shown on drawing received and dated 17 April 1986.

O.G. 86-128	1657 31st Street, N. W. Dumbarton Court Owners, Inc.	Alteration and repair

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for restoration and repairs indicated in photo/drawing received and dated 24 April 1986.

O.G. 86-133	1576 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Texaco, Inc.	Alteration and repair - storefront

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for renovation of service station as shown on drawing received and dated 30 May 1986. Note change to elevation drawing which indicates that top row of glazed panels will be textured or translucent glass.

O.G. 86-136	3011 P Street, N. W. Robert and Jane Cafritz	Alteration and repair

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for proposed deck and casement doors as shown on drawing received and dated 30 April 1986.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-130	1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Peter Schwartz	Raze building

ACTION: Withdrawn by request of applicant.

O.G. 86-108	1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Peter Schwartz	New mixed-use building: Conceptual

ACTION: Withdrawn by request of applicant.

O.G. 86-109	1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Peter Schwartz	Raze building

ACTION: Submission has been superseded by O.G. case 86-130.

O.G. 86-157	3300 M Street, N. W. 3300 M Street, Northwest Limited Partnership	New commercial building

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new commercial building. Working drawings and letter from applicant dated 20 May assure that there have been no deviations from the concept design as approved by the CFA on 21 February 1986.

O.G. 86-117	1221-1225 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Alice M. Craven	Renovation and addition: Conceptual

ACTION: Submission superseded by O.G. 86-125 and O.G. 86-126.

---

12 June 1986

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-139	1325 & 1327 30th Street, N. W. Philip Abraham	Addition: Conceptual

ACTION: Recommend against concept design of proposed addition as excessive in size and inappropriate to the character of the existing historic houses. Should applicant wish to pursue possible alternatives, recommend study of one story basement/ground floor addition in lighter materials and character. The existing first floor garden elevation should remain unaltered.

O.G. 86-141	3050 P Street, N. W. Biddle	Entrance stoop

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. Previous recommendation against use of masonry for stoop is reaffirmed (see O.G. 86-97). Recommend restoration using steel reinforcing concealed by wood carriage duplicating existing design.

O.G. 86-118	3040 M Street, N. W. Canal Square Associates	Alteration and canopy

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for the proposed alterations and awning as shown on supplemental drawings received and dated 19 May 1986.

O.G. 86-148	1054 31st Street, N. W. Canal Square Associates	Alteration and repair

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit. Drawings received and dated 8 May 1986 comply with approved concept design (see O.G. 86-24).

O.G. 86-121	1218 31st Street, N. W. Ann Brinkley	Awning/sign

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for an awning/sign at this location as such a structure would be out of character with this small 19th century building. Recommend study of a suitable, projecting, wood sign.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-146	1313 28th Street, N. W. Nicholas Platt	Alteration and repair

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for the renovations as shown on drawings received and dated 8 May 1986.

O.G. 86-147	1068 31st Street, N. W. Esther B. Davis	Alteration and repair of parking area fence

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed fence alterations as indicated in materials received and dated 8 May 1986.

O.G. 86-144	1236 36th Street, N. W. Georgetown University, Investment Properties	Sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for cloth banner mounted at 2nd floor center, near height of top of windows. Mounting bracket shall be removable without permanent damage to building.

O.G. 86-137	3304 M Street, N. W. Dunn Brady Associates	Alterations and 2-story addition: Conceptual

ACTION: Superseded by O.G. 86-160.

O.G. 86-160	3304 M Street, N. W. Dunn Brady Associates	Alterations and 2-story addition: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for brick addition on alley and alterations to storefronts as shown on supplemental drawings received and dated 23 May 1986.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-151	3701-3719 Winfield Lane, N. W. Porten Sullivan Corporation	New townhouses

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for new townhouses as shown on supplemental working drawings and landscape schedule received and dated 3 June 1986.

O.G. 86-132	1731 34th Street, N. W. Mr. and Mrs. Carmi Schooler	Alteration and repair

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for alterations and new deck at rear of residence as shown in supplemental drawing received and dated 21 May 1986.

O.G. 86-127	3015 M Street, N. W. The West End Corporation	Awnings

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for interior work and for single color awning across front of building. All lettering shall be confined to the valance area and none shall be on the shed face of the awning or on end panels.

O.G. 86-126	1225 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Alice M. Craven Trust	Storefront remodeling

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed remodeling of existing building front as shown on supplemental drawing received and dated 5 June 1986.

O.G. 86-129	3200 S Street, N. W. J. Mayo Brown	Studio house addition

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for the proposed studio house addition. Working drawings received and dated 28 April 1986 conform to approved design (see O.G. 86-34).

---

12 June 1986

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-166	3800 Reservoir Road, N. W. Georgetown University	Leavey Center

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for the proposed student center as shown on working drawings and related landscape schedule received and dated 11 June 1986. Note that approval of working drawings does not include the design for guest facility penthouse as shown in the drawings submitted. Design as shown would be unacceptable.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

12 June 1986

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Carolyn Deaver Hon. Frederick E. Hart Hon. Neil H. Porterfield Hon. Pascal Regan Hon. Diane Wolf
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue A. Kohler
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. Robert Cousins
D. C. Historic Preservation Board staff present:	Ms. Suzanne Ganschinietz

Executive Session: Before the public meeting the Commission met in executive session for the purpose of electing a Chairman and Vice Chairman. The Chairman began by noting that the Federal Advisory Act allows the Commission to be in executive session for internal administrative purposes. He then asked for nominations for Chairman, and Mrs. Regan nominated him to continue in that office; Senator Goodman seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations for Chairman, and nominations for Vice-Chairman were called for. Miss Wolf nominated Mr. Porterfield, seconded by Mr. Hart. There were no further nominations and Senator Goodman moved that the Commission proceed to a vote. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hart and a vote was taken, with Mr. Brown being re-elected Chairman and Mr. Porterfield elected Vice Chairman, both unanimously.

The Chairman thanked the members for their vote of confidence and then made several observations on the influence of the Commission and the importance of acting as a collegial body. He cautioned about speaking to the press between meetings on matters pending before the Commission, and there was a discussion of the appropriate response to make when views were solicited--whether to refrain from comment, or to stress that any statements made were those of an individual member and did not reflect the views of the entire Commission. Mr. Hart thought it important to retain the individual's right to comment; Senator Goodman and Mrs. Regan stressed that the official spokesman should be the Chairman, and Mr. Porterfield suggested that members with expertise in one subject should confer with the Chairman when they thought their views might be requested. Miss Wolf said she thought it was important that the members keep an open dialogue between meetings on matters of concern to the Commission; all agreed this was important, but it was thought that, as much as possible, such discussions should take place at the meetings, when everyone was present.

The executive session was adjourned and the public meeting opened at 10:00 a.m.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of 17 April 1986 minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved.

B. Dates of next meetings: Approved as: 31 July 1986 (Thursday)
18 September 1986 (Thursday)

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

CFA 12/JUN/86-7, Gold and Silver Bullion Coins. Report and discussion of designs circulated by request of Mint. The Chairman began the discussion by reviewing the Mint's request that the members approve or disapprove the design, based on photographs circulated by mail in May, because time restrictions precluded review at this meeting. He said there had not been a consensus, and the members felt it was too important an issue not to be discussed at a meeting. He said that he realized that by insisting on review at a regular meeting the Commission might have forfeited its ability to effect any changes in the designs of these coins, but thought that the discussion with the Treasury at this meeting might have positive results in the future. He asked Mr. John F. Rogers, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Management, who was present at the meeting, what the time restrictions were.

Mr. Rogers said they were quite far along in the design process, but he would not want that to preclude receiving the Commission's advice. The Chairman said in that case the Commission would proceed with its regular review.

Staff member Sue Kohler began by informing the members that the Mint had brought in large plaster models for them to examine, and said there were also examples of the original Saint-Gaudens and Weinman coins on which the designs were based. She noted that, in addition to Mr. Rogers, there were several other people present who had been closely involved with this project; she then introduced the Director of the Mint, Donna Pope. Mrs. Pope introduced Mr. Rogers and Deputy Treasurer Paul Bateman. She said she was happy that the Chairman had brought up the time schedule because it was a very strict one, and she asked Mr. Rogers to address some aspects of the designs that had been of concern to the members.

Before doing this Mr. Rogers reported that the Secretary of the Treasury had called for a design committee, and he said that in the future he would be addressing ways in which the members of the Commission of Fine Arts could be involved. The Chairman said he was happy to hear this and knew the members would like to have an early input into design matters.

Turning to the coin designs, Mr. Rogers showed the plaster models and said that, especially in light of the time constraints, Secretary of the Treasury Baker had decided that they could do no better than reproduce two of the finest American coin designs of the past, the Saint-Gaudens Double Eagle of 1907 and the Weinman "Walking Liberty" half-dollar of 1916. He said that, personally, he agreed with this choice, as did many people in the field of numismatics. He noted that the Saint-Gaudens coin had been modified several times soon after it was first designed, and then pointed out the changes in the new version: the figure of Liberty had been slimmed down slightly, the number of stars around the edge increased from 46 to 50, and the original Roman numeral date restored.

The Chairman said he had great difficulty in telling the difference, and Burke Wilkinson, the biographer of Saint-Gaudens who was present at the meeting, said he thought Saint-Gaudens would have approved of the modifications; he noted that the sculptor had been used to having his designs changed slightly.

Miss Wolf said she disagreed with this assessment. She said she thought the body and drapery lacked the sensuousness of the original and the face was more generic. She asked Mrs. Pope if the original dies could be used and was told they were no longer extant. Miss Wolf then

quoted from a letter in which Saint-Gaudens said, "My idea is to make it [art] a living thing and typical of progress." She said she thought the art of today was the one gift we would give to the future, and as coins were a form of art looked at and held every day, they were of sufficient importance that competitions should be held for their design and our foremost artists invited to enter. She read a letter from Lewis Sharp, curator of the American Wing of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, who had been in charge of the recent Saint-Gaudens exhibition. The letter stressed the need for new coins designed by notable artists.
Exhibit A

Mrs. Regan agreed with this viewpoint, but said she liked the modified Saint-Gaudens and thought it was well done.

The new design for the reverse of the gold coins was then discussed. (Note: four gold coins of the same design but different weights and denominations would be issued, ranging in diameter from 1 5/16" down to 5/8".) Mr. Rogers said the Treasury had little control over the reverse, since a design featuring a nest of eagles had been specified in the legislation, and that Congress had had in mind a suggested design by a contemporary sculptor, Miley Busiek. He said Mrs. Busiek was a strong lobbyist, and all the Department could do was to modify her design slightly for technical reasons. Mr. Wilkinson read Saint-Gaudens's own words about the use of another artist's reverse design in lieu of his own on a medal he had designed for the 1893 fair in Chicago: "Mr. Carlyle may have the legal right to combine my work with that of another on the same medal, but the rare shamelessness of such offense will be appreciated by all my confreres at home and abroad, and it is as much in their interest as in my own unbridled astonishment that I make this protest public."

Miss Wolf said she appreciated Mr. Wilkinson's comments and thought it important that the reverse complement the obverse. She said this was not the case with this design, and she was particularly worried about how the reverse design would look on the smallest coin. She said she did agree with Mrs. Busiek's comments that the Mint should set up a process whereby private artists could have their work reviewed.

Mr. Rogers said modifications had been made to Mrs. Busiek's design to accommodate it to the small size coin, but he agreed that in this case there was not a proper marriage between obverse and reverse. Mrs. Pope added that the Mint had been aware of the technical problems and had worked hard to solve them.

Senator Goodman asked why it had been thought necessary to modify the original design. Mr. Rogers said that after the first interpretation it was felt some changes were needed; he added, however, that these were slight and the new design was very close to the original. Senator Goodman said he had some hesitation about taking original works of art and modernizing them; the other members agreed with this statement. Mr. Porterfield said he worried about this tendency in all fields of art, and he

hoped that an art truly representative of the end of the 20th century would materialize. Miss Wolf asked Mrs. Pope if an exact copy of the Saint-Gaudens could be made; Mrs. Pope said it would be extremely difficult.

The Chairman said he thought it was time to come to a decision. Mr. Hart said that while he could not vote against Saint-Gaudens, he felt strongly that a new design should have been used and so would abstain from voting. The other members agreed that they could, reluctantly, approve the designs this time, but in the future expected that new work would be used.

Mr. Hart said he was really concerned that the considerable talent available in this country was not being used; he said that thus far, all the designs he had seen from the Mint had been of poor quality. He added that he did not think another committee was needed to review designs since that was the function of the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Rogers said they did hope to improve the quality of their designs, but he thought the Mint had talented artists and he would like them to participate also; he noted that time constraints often precluded competitions. As to the new committee being proposed, he said it would be set up by the Treasury with representation from the Commission of Fine Arts, perhaps through a subcommittee that would be invited to see early designs.

The Chairman thanked Mrs. Pope, Mr. Rogers and Mr. Bateman, and the others who had testified and written, and said he thought the discussion had been very useful. Exhibits A-1 through A-11

B. General Services Administration

CFA 12/JUN/86-10, Pennsylvania Avenue at 12th Street, N. W. Report of subcommittee meeting 16 May 1986 and submission of revised design of the Nancy Hanks Memorial, the Old Post Office Plaza. Mrs. Kohler recalled the presentation at the April meeting of a design for a commemorative marker by designer Rudolph de Harak, the questioning at that time of the depiction of the Old Post Office on the marker, and the request for a mock-up to judge size and placement. She recalled that the Commission had delegated authority to the local members to inspect this mock-up before the next meeting. She said this had been done at a meeting on 16 May at which Mr. de Harak was present, and at that time questions arose concerning the design as well; there was agreement that a circular marker flush with the pavement would be preferable to the "bent coin" design of the original presentation, although those present (The Chairman, Mrs. Deaver, Mr. Hart and Miss Wolf) said they would be happy to review any other suggestions.

Mrs. Kohler said GSA was now submitting a design for a much smaller circular bronze marker--42 inches as opposed to 8 feet--on which a quotation

from Miss Hanks would be inscribed. Instead of a location on the plaza, it would be moved near the turret east of the Pennsylvania Avenue entrance, so that it would not be walked on. She showed a site plan and a drawing of the marker. There were no objections to the design or location, although Miss Wolf asked that more space be left between the words, "Nancy Hanks Center". Mr. Hart said he wanted to make it clear that the subcommittee had not recommended this design but had just expressed its preference for it over the original. Miss Wolf requested that notes be kept of such committee meetings, although the Chairman observed that it was difficult to do this when they took the form of a site or mock-up inspection.

Marilyn Farley from GSA was introduced to answer questions. Mrs. Deaver asked if the marker would be erected with private funds; Ms. Farley said it would be funded by the government, as provided for in the legislation. There was no further discussion of the design and it was unanimously approved. Exhibit B

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 12/JUN/86-1, Pennsylvania Avenue at 8th Street, N. W. Review of full-size clay model of Lone Sailor sculpture at the Navy Memorial. The Secretary recalled the Commission's approval, in June 1985, of a smaller maquette and said the full-size clay model was now ready. He introduced Admiral Thompson from the Navy Memorial Foundation, and said that he had gone to sculptor Stanley Bleifeld's studio with Admiral Thompson and Architect of the Capitol George White, Chairman of the design committee of PADC, to view the model. Slides were shown and the Secretary noted, for the new members' information, that the sculptor had worked from photographs of a model standing in the wind, to recall the conditions associated with being at sea.

The Chairman commented that this was just a follow-up review, and asked the Secretary and Admiral Thompson if they felt the clay model was faithful to the small maquette approved earlier. They felt that it was, and the Secretary said that Mr. White agreed. Mrs. Regan asked if the sculpture would be standing on a base; the Chairman said it would not be on a true base but would be raised slightly from the surface so that the figure did not appear to be walking on the water. There were no objections to the sculpture and no further questions, and it was unanimously approved.

Exhibit C

D. Smithsonian Institution

1. CFA 12/JUN/86-3, Sign program for identification of museum buildings. The Assistant Secretary noted that several of the members had seen mock-ups of the proposed signs on their pre-meeting tour, and then introduced Phillip Reiss and Jim Mahoney from the Smithsonian to make the presentation. Mr. Reiss said blue had been the traditional color for Smithsonian signs, but as it had a tendency to fade, they

had decided to try a reddish color, with a gold sunburst (the Smithsonian logo) and lettering, thinking that this color combination would also be more visible. Mr. Mahoney said the type face used was Baskerville, and it was available in a bolder face for signs intended to be seen by motorists.

Senator Goodman stressed that the lettering must be legible from a distance and thought the logo would be helpful in directing people. Mrs. Regan thought the bright colors were needed or the signs would not be noticed. On the other hand, Mr. Hart thought the colors too jarring for Mall use. Mr. Porterfield thought the logo too strong to be used in the Federal City and not as important as the name of the museum. He did not object to the blue color fading or blending into the green background as long as the name of the building was visible. He thought there ought to be some coordination among all federal agencies needing such signs so that the visual chaos that now greets visitors could be reduced. Miss Wolf agreed, feeling that all federal signs needed reviewing and a task force to do this should be set up.

The Chairman said there was a group in the NEA working on this, but the problem was that there was never a time when all the agencies had sufficient funds to redo their signs. He thought perhaps the Smithsonian signs could be a bellwether and others could be persuaded to coordinate with them. He thought the red paint and chrome were too jarring and that the Smithsonian should go back to blue and concentrate on legibility of the lettering and use of the logo as an identifying symbol. Miss Wolf said she did not like the use of logos because people don't recognize them, but the other members found them useful and quickly recognizable.

In summary, the Chairman suggested that the Smithsonian go back to the blue color, concentrate on legibility, and find out what the NEA was doing so that all efforts could be coordinated. The signs were not approved. Exhibit D

2. CFA 12/JUN/86-9, Jefferson Drive, S. W., The Mall. Concept design for new ramp/stair to north entrance of Castle. The Assistant Secretary said the locations for the ramp and stairs had been inspected on the pre-meeting tour. He introduced Phillip Reiss, James Buckler and Mary Grace Potter from the Smithsonian; Ms. Potter was asked to begin the presentation. She said there was a need for an information center at the Smithsonian to orient visitors and direct them to the museums they wanted to visit; she commented that many tourists arrived thinking that all the museums were housed in one building. It had been decided to put this center in the Great Hall of the Castle, the best-known of the buildings, and since the steps at the north entrance were difficult or impossible for the handicapped, elderly, or people with children in strollers, two new entrances, to the east and west of the main entrance, had been planned, one with a ramp, the other with stairs.

These were pointed out drawings and a model. She said the two entrances would be convenient for both the Metro and Tourmobile groups. She pointed out that there would also be two entrances from the south, or Quadrangle side of the Castle. There were no objections to the concept design of the entrances and it was unanimously approved. Mr. Porterfield asked Mr. Buckler what would happen to several large hollies. Mr. Buckler said they would be moved, but kept in the same general area.

Exhibit E

E. Department of State, International Center

CFA 12/JUN/86-4, Van Ness Street and Reno Road, N. W. Concept design alternatives for security-maintenance facility. Mr. Carson said the members would see two concept variations for this facility, which would have four stories above and four below ground and would include 52,000 square feet of office space. He said the material would be primarily cast stone. Michael Newell, director of the International Center development, was then introduced. He said the facility would be basically a federal office building for chanceries in the area, including those on Massachusetts Avenue. He said one design proposed, with a tower, would exceed NCPC's maximum height limitation, but both would conform to the master plan. He introduced architect William Lenyk, from Leo A. Daly Associates, to discuss the project.

Mr. Lenyk pointed out the site on drawings and a model, noting that it was in the center of the area, on top of a hill, adjacent to the central park. He said studies had been made of the circulation patterns, environmental impact, sun control, and grading. The building would be oriented toward the park with service areas at the rear. Architecturally, there would be a three-part massing in each version: a tower and two wings in one and a core and two wings in the other. Vertically, the tower version would be divided into a base, central section and pitched tile roof; in the alternate version the roof would be flat. Mr. Lenyk said they had tried to give the building a civic character because of its function.

The members agreed generally that the tower version was better than the alternate, that it was more friendly and related better to the chanceries in the Center. However, there were misgivings about the siting, at the top of a hill, and the height of the building itself. Miss Wolf thought the host country's building should welcome and serve and have more of a community center feeling. The Chairman thought some grading of the hill would help, and ideally, one story should be removed. He said he had no objection to the tower concept and asked if NCPC would approve it as an architectural embellishment. Mr. Lenyk said they had wanted to have the Commission of Fine Arts' reaction before requesting a variance from NCPC. There was further discussion of the height of the building relative to others in the Center, with the suggestion that it might be allowed to spread into the central park area, which both Mr. Hart and Mr. Porterfield thought was unlikely to be used very much.

The Chairman told Mr. Newell and Mr. Lenyk that the Commission could not approve either of the concept designs at this time. He said that while the basic design of the tower version would be acceptable, it had to be lowered in some way, either by reducing the program or expanding into the park. He noted that the existing buildings were all three stories high and this one, set on a hill, would be four.

Exhibit F

F. United States Army

1. CFA 12/JUN/86-5, Arlington Cemetery. Design development for Visitor Center. The Assistant Secretary recalled that the Commission had reviewed this before, and said it was now in the design development stage and being submitted for further review. He said that, similarily, design development details would be submitted for the parking garage and landscaping when ready. Architect Donald Lethbridge was introduced and said he would like to discuss three items--materials, modifications to the entrance gates, and the skylight. He began with the last item, noting that it had been controversial. He showed drawings with the original barrel-vaulted form, commenting that he preferred this both because of its appearance and because it was structurally more sound than a segmental form, which he showed next. He pointed out that the segmental form would need side buttressing, and although the interior effect would be satisfactory, the vault would be barely visible from the exterior and the building would lose the character it had in its original form. Miss Wolf asked about the number of stories and the height; Mr. Lethbridge said it would be a one story building, 43 feet at its highest point. He said the 50 foot high oak trees along Memorial Drive, and the hedge, would cut the view of the building except from between the trees at the entrance. Mr. Lethbridge then showed a series of slides taken from within the model to show how the building would actually appear from important vantage points.

Mr. Porterfield said he had changed his mind and was convinced that the barrel vault should remain. Mrs. Regan said she liked it because it kept the form of the niches. Mr. Porterfield asked about visibility from the heights of the cemetery and was told that the planting was so heavy that it would not be seen. Senator Goodman asked about heat transmittal through the vault. Mr. Lethbridge said the glass would be solar grey--a light shade--and that heat would be controlled by air conditioning and recirculation of air. He said the space beneath the vault would be used for exhibitions and visitor information and there would frequently be 800 to 1000 people in that area.

Mr. Lethbridge then discussed materials. He said the building would be faced with stucco, in an umber color, and the base would be granite; the vault material had already been discussed. Paving would be Hastings block. Mr. Lethbridge said the last item he wanted to bring up was a proposed change to the entrance gates. He showed a drawing, pointing out that the gates had been set back farther and the posts

redesigned, so that as one looked up Memorial Drive they would resemble the other niches. He said final drawings would be submitted later with the site work.

There was a discussion of the means of getting from the parking lot and Metro to the Visitor Center, and of a suggestion that the building should be moved farther to the east. In regard to the latter, Mr. Lethbridge said it would not work as well because it would be more difficult to screen. The Chairman observed that it would lose the character of a pavilion in a grove of trees. There were no further questions and no community comment, and the members agreed unanimously to approve the design development and the materials, with actual samples and final drawings to be seen later. Exhibit G

III. The members adjourned for lunch at 12:55 and the meeting was reconvened at 1:35 p.m. Mrs. Deaver was not present for the first part of the afternoon session.

2. CFA 12/JUN/86-6, Fort McNair. Concept design for alterations and additions to Commissary. The Assistant Secretary located the commissary on a plan of Fort McNair, off to the east of the entrance area, not close to the formal parade ground and major buildings. He said the existing facility consisted of two 19th century stable buildings joined by an infill structure, and the plan was to keep the 19th century buildings, renovate the interiors, and replace the deteriorated infill building with new construction. Herbert Eichler from the Corps of Engineers was introduced to discuss the project in more detail and answer questions. He showed drawings of the new construction, noted that it picked up on characteristics of the old buildings, and in answer to a question, said the material would be brick to match the existing. There were no objections and the project was unanimously approved. Exhibit H

G. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs.

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 86-80, -99, 3100 Macomb Street, N. W. Concept designs for new academic building and renovation of greenhouse at the International School. The Assistant Secretary noted that the site had been visited in April and again before this meeting. He located the Tregaron estate, now used by the school, and the 1909 mansion, designed by Charles Platt. He said there had been miscellaneous outbuildings--a barn, greenhouse, and stables--some still there as part of the academic campus. He noted that part of the original estate had been sold. He said the submission was for a new academic building to be built adjacent to an existing one housed in an old stable, and for renovation of an existing greenhouse for academic purposes.

Architect Cal Bowie was introduced to discuss the proposal. He located the property on a map, pointing out the boundaries of Rock Creek Park, and observing that it was very difficult to see any of the buildings, or the proposed new building site, from the park. He showed drawings of his design for the new academic building and discussed briefly its relationship to the existing buildings. The Chairman said the Commission's responsibility under the Shipstead-Luce Act lay in reviewing what could be seen from the park, and he questioned Mr. Bowie on this aspect of his design. When Mr. Bowie said he didn't think anything could be seen, even in the winter, the Chairman said he thought the Commission had discharged its responsibility and would have no objection to the proposal. Exhibit I

b. S.L. 86-113, 750 17th Street, N. W. Revised design for new office building. Mr. Carson recalled that the Commission had seen this design in concept form in January and at that time had two recommendations: the first to try to articulate the top of the building a little more, and the second to articulate the ground floor more fully so that it would be more accessible to the public. He introduced architect Tom Eichbaum, from Keyes, Condon and Florance, to discuss the changes that had been made.

Mr. Eichbaum showed both old and new drawings. He said height restrictions did not give them enough room for a strong cornice, so they had dropped the cornice line one floor, made it a strong line around the building and treated the top floor as an attic story. To give the top some emphasis, a balustrade in the form of a metal railing had been added. At the ground floor level, more rustification had been added and a more concise storefront design, including signage areas, had been developed. Mr. Eichbaum showed detailed drawings of the proposed storefronts. He also pointed out differences in the fenestration design that had been suggested by the client.

The Chairman asked for comments by the members, particularly on the aspects of the design that had been criticized before. There was general agreement that the treatment of the cornice and the ground floor constituted improvements, but the metal railing "balustrade" was not considered successful. With this one reservation, the revised design was unanimously approved. (Mrs. Regan returned to the meeting during this discussion.) Exhibit I

c. Appendix I. Approved

Before beginning the Georgetown submissions, the Assistant Secretary passed around a letter from Wynant Vanderpool on behalf of the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown, noting that the members had previously been sent copies. He reviewed the contents: the request that Mrs. Alicia Boyd be considered the official representative from the Foundation, and the recommendations for changes in the procedures and operation of the Georgetown Board. He said that with the Commission's consensus, the staff would study the recommendations with

the Georgetown Board and confer with the Commission on the matter at a later date. The Chairman said he had studied the recommendations, as had the other members, and considered them helpful and plausible. It was recommended that the staff proceed to discuss them with the Georgetown Board.

Mrs. Boyd said the real reason for the letter was to thank the Georgetown Board for all they had done, most recently for the statement of their policy on additions to houses in Georgetown. She said the Foundation had always been concerned with open space, the existing scale and historic patterns, and considered those the most important issues in Georgetown. She said Mr. Vanderpool, who was ill, sent his personal regards, and the Chairman noted, for the information of the members, that Mr. Vanderpool was a former member of the Georgetown Board who had served for many years. Exhibit J

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 86-104, and -110, 1054 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W. Proposed razing of existing structures and concept design of replacement building. The Assistant Secretary reported that the site had been seen by the Georgetown Board and members of the Commission, and he passed out the Board's report, recommending against the razing. It was felt that these buildings, while not individually important, contributed significantly to the setting of the historic district. He showed historic photographs of the area, pointing out the very special group of small houses on the other side of the Canal, and the landmark Masonic Temple building facing Thomas Jefferson Street. He said the Board had reacted against the original proposal, which he showed to the members, feeling that the scale was inappropriate to the site. He said the Board was requesting the Commission's viewpoint on whether a modest addition to the buildings would be in order. The architect, George Hartman of Hartman/Cox, was introduced to show slides and discuss his proposal.

While showing his slides Mr. Hartman commented that the existing building facing 31st Street was too tight on the canal, in fact came right up to the lock, and would look better if moved back 20 feet. He said his proposed addition would not come up above the existing buildings to the south, and noted that large warehouse-type buildings were actually traditional along the canal; he showed slides of such buildings to the west of 31st Street. He discussed the various options and the difficulty of adding on to the old buildings.

The Chairman said one option was to do nothing at all. He said he considered this block a very precious few feet along the canal because of its small scale, the green edge along the buildings in question, and the tiny houses on the other side. He said he did not mind that one section of the building came right up to the canal, as it served to cup the space around the Thomas Jefferson Street section, more commonly known

as the former office of architect Chloethiel Woodard Smith, who had remodeled it in the sixties. He said the Commission had to consider the character of the historic district, not the possible revenue of the owner, and he thought this was one case where the line should be held.

Mrs. Regan thought it was colorful and interesting the way it was--and not commercial--and should be left alone. Mr. Porterfield said he sensed a dilemma--he knew the building was mediocre and there was a potential for replacing it with something better, but at the same time there was no assurance that a new building would keep the special charm of the area, and now, people at least were familiar with what was there and happy with it. Miss Wolf said she had a real problem with replacing buildings in an historic district; she thought they should be accepted, even if mediocre, because they gave the area its character. She said she was also against Mr. Hartman's proposal to fill in a small notch on the 31st Street side; she thought these small openings were part of Georgetown's charm.

Mrs. Boyd asked to comment. She had transcribed the tape of the Georgetown Board meeting at which this project was discussed, and she thought the members had stated the case very well when they said the unique character of this area was based on existing conditions, that the low edge of the canal on both sides created a special relationship both in the block and on the edge of the block. She said the Board was very concerned about the open space and the thread of continuity of lower scale buildings in this block.

The Chairman said he thought there was a consensus that the buildings should be left as they were; the other members agreed, and the demolition request was unanimously disapproved. Exhibits I, I-1

b. O.G. 86-149, 907 30th Street, N. W. Final design for public space improvements at the Rosewood Hotel. Mr. Carson reported that there was a combination of Washington Harbour and Rosewood Hotel interests in this area. He said the Commission had already approved the public space design for Washington Harbour and this proposal would match--the brown pavers, granite dividers, Washington globe street lights, and London plane trees would all be used. He noted that some members had toured the site the day before the meeting. There were no objections and the project was unanimously approved. Exhibit I

c. O.G. 86-153, and -154, 3520 and 3524 Reservoir Road, N. W. Concept design for two new townhouses at The Cloisters. Mr. Carson said these designs were for two adjacent sites within the Cloisters complex, on Reservoir Road. He said the Georgetown Board had recommended that they be approved for design development. Architect Scott Stinson from Stinson-Capelli was introduced to answer questions, and the Chairman asked him if the houses would be right on the street. Mr. Stinson said

they would, and pointed out the location. There were no objections and the concept design was unanimously approved. Exhibit I

d. O.G. 86-138, 1609 33rd Street, N. W. Proposed razing of garage. Mrs. Kohler showed photographs of this garage structure just above Q Street on the east side of 33rd, and said it had been built in 1914 as a wagon shed for a dairy whose offices were on Q Street. She said the razing request had been reviewed by the Georgetown Board, and while recognizing that it was a building of considerable age, they also noted that it was of little historical or architectural significance and that it was a commercial structure in a residential neighborhood. As the replacement structure would be residential, the Board said they would not oppose the razing, although they chose not to review the proposed design at that time.

There were no objections to the demolition, although Miss Wolf noted that this was another example of a mediocre building that had existed for a long time in an historic district. While not comparable to the situation on Thomas Jefferson Street, she thought it did raise the question of where to draw the line when considering demolition requests. The Chairman said these were the kinds of questions the Commission had to decide. Mr. Hart thought there was little to recommend retention in this case, and the Assistant Secretary reminded the members that zoning would require that the replacement be residential, and the Commission would have full control over its design. Miss Wolf said she hoped that the new building would at least appear to be two or three small houses, rather than one large one, so that it would be compatible with the others on the street. The demolition was then unanimously approved. Exhibit I

e. O.G. 86-155, and -156, 1677-79 and 1675 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Alterations, repairs and reconstruction for the Aramus Corporation. The Assistant Secretary passed out copies of the Georgetown Board's report on this project, which involved the restoration and repair of three old houses at the corner of Wisconsin Avenue and Reservoir Street, a project which had been under Commission review for some time. The report said the Board had no objection,(providing the D. C. government's rules and regulations had been observed) to the patching, repairing, and putting back together of the houses, including the size, configuration and siding of the reconstruction of the rear of one of them. He said the staff would recommend that the Commission address the appearance of those aspects of the repair and restoration that were visible from public space and leave the bureaucracy to work out details of the permit process and any other D. C. government requirements. He added that the D. C. Historic Preservation Review Board had no objections to the work being submitted at this meeting.

The architect, William Cochran, was introduced and showed detail drawings of the repair and reconstruction; he also discussed the kind of siding to be used.

Mrs. Alicia Boyd asked at this point to submit a statement from the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown in which it was stated that the historic fabric of the old houses was being changed drastically. The Georgetown Board was thanked for its concern and on-site inspections of this project and urged to continue its vigilance. Mrs. Boyd said the community would have no objections to what was before the Commission at this meeting, but was concerned that proper procedures were not being followed.

Mr. Courts Oulahan, attorney for a property owner on Reservoir Street, then asked to speak. He said he thought the Commission should be aware that no permit had been issued for the reconstruction of the illegally removed rear section of one of the houses, and that a stop order relating to this and other violations was still in effect. He asked that the Commission state, as had the Georgetown Board, that it was not approving plans for the reconstruction, or anything else that had not been processed by the District; otherwise, he said, a precedent would be set.

Mrs. Frank, representing the Citizens Association of Georgetown, said they had not had an opportunity to discuss the case, but personally, she hoped that something could be done to expedite the restoration because the site was such an eyesore.

Mark Policy, attorney for Aramus Corporation, said a permit had been obtained, but there was some confusion as to just what the permit was for.

The Chairman said the Commission could only speak to matters of exterior design, and he thought there was a consensus that the members would back the Georgetown Board in their recommendation to approve what had been submitted at this meeting and hope that the other questions would be solved by those concerned. The exterior details submitted were then unanimously approved. Exhibit I

f. O.G. 86-135, 1692 31st Street, N. W. Concept design for alterations and additions to private residence. The Assistant Secretary said the Georgetown Board had reviewed drawings for this proposal, visited the site, and given the architect, Heather Cass, a copy of their recent policy on additions to Georgetown houses. Although the Board determined on the site that there would be minimal visibility of the proposed rear addition, the architect subsequently reduced its scale, and after a second review, the Board agreed to recommend approval of the concept design. The Assistant Secretary said the community was pleased with the revised design.

Ms. Cass showed the members drawings of the proposed addition and alterations, and they were unanimously approved. Exhibit I

g. O.G. 86-156, 3530 Water Street, N. W. Concept design for alteration and addition to Potomac Boat Club. Mr. Carson located the Boat Club, just west of Key Bridge, and said the original structure was built in 1908 to the designs of A. B. Mullett and Company. He said the proposal was to add a second floor addition to a 1960's brick section with a new tower element facing Water Street. He said the Georgetown Board had reviewed the drawings and had one minor recommendation--that the addition as seen from Water Street be sheathed in shingles to contrast with the tower element.

The architect, Richard P. Williams, showed drawings and pointed out that the second story addition would be set well back on an existing deck. He showed the corner brick tower element and a perspective view of the enlarged building as seen from Key Bridge. He noted that the adjacent townhouses might be razed and said the elevation facing them had been planned with that in mind. There were no objections and the additions were unanimously approved, subject to the Georgetown Board's recommendations. Exhibit I

h. Appendix II. Approved.

H. National Park Service, National Capital Region

1. CFA 12/JUN/86-2, Constitution Avenue between 7th and 9th Streets, N. W. Revised pavilion design and concept design for landscaping at the National Sculpture Garden. Before the discussion began, the Chairman noted that the sculpture for this garden would come from the National Gallery, and as Director of that institution, he asked the other members if they would prefer that he leave the room; or, that he remain as an observer, but turn the gavel over to the Vice Chairman and not take part in the discussion; or, a third option would be that he continue in his role as Chairman. Senator Goodman suggested that he remain, keep the gavel, but not vote. Mr. Hart seconded that suggestion and all agreed.

Mr. Carson pointed out the location of the sculpture garden and skating pool in relation to the rest of the Mall and noted that the pool and ring of trees around it were existing. He said this would be a two-part submission: a revised design for the restaurant and a concept design for the garden. He introduced John Parsons from the Park Service to review the history of the project. Mr. Parsons said it went back to the 1960's master plan for the Mall and that Phase I, including the pool and trees, had gone ahead in 1971. Since then there had been funding problems, although early in the 1980's the restaurant pavilion had been revived and there had been a new concept for the sculpture

garden; at that time both the pavilion and garden concept had been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts. Now, Mr. Parsons said, the basic concepts had remained but some details had been changed. The firm of Urban and Associates, landscape architects, had been retained, and Mr. Parsons introduced Jim Urban to discuss changes that had been made.

Mr. Urban said his firm had been hired to implement the master plan prepared by landscape architect Dan Kiley and architects Skidmore, Owings & Merrill. He said the concept of four garden rooms, eventually to have sculpture in them, had remained. The Park Service would maintain the area, and the National Gallery of Art would supply the sculpture and the necessary security, a guard for each room. The rooms would be closed at night but people would still be able to enter the skating and food areas. There would be a fence around the entire area with three primary gates. At this point, Mr. Urban said, there were plans for placing lights along the walks and around the pool, but none for lighting the sculpture. He said this submission was concerned primarily with the master plan aspect and that details would be developed and seen later.

Landscape architect Dan Kiley was then introduced. He said he had been associated with this project for twenty years, first with PADC and then with architects Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, and now with both SOM and Mr. Urban. He showed drawings of the garden, pointing out that the basic scheme was framed by a cordon of trees with the four gardens within. He said the principal trees in two of the gardens would be weeping--cherries in one and willows in the other--while the other two would have upright trees, either river birch or amalanchier. A hedge of yew would define each space. Paving would be a kind of crushed stone that would provide a solid feeling under foot. Mr. Kiley then showed slides of the basic plantings and others to be used throughout the garden.

Richard Giegengack from SOM was then introduced. He reviewed the history of the restaurant pavilion, saying that the first design dated from 1966 and was approved in 1971, although it had been approved again in an enlarged version in 1984. Now, he said, it had been scaled-down and the glass walls had been removed, making it an informal, open-air restaurant. The pavilion had been reduced in size, primarily in width, and the supplemental kiosks removed from the scheme. He said the colors would remain the same: dark green for the roof and lighter green for the metal, tree-like supports. In answer to a question from Mr. Porterfield, he said trash would be removed through a sidewalk elevator at the rear connecting to a tunnel in the basement. The main problem remaining, Mr. Giegengack said, was where to store the Zamboni for the skating rink. The Chairman suggested that a kiosk or tent-like structure might be used, and Mr. Giegengack was asked to study this for the next submission.

Mr. Porterfield commented on the nature of the garden complex in relation to the rest of the Mall, noting that it would be in reality more akin to a structure in its solidity; he said it would change the open space quality of that part of the Mall, and while he did not object to this, he thought it should be pointed out. The Chairman agreed, but said this was actually part of the program, an attempt to provide some relief from the vast openness as well as to provide an enclosure for the sculpture, which it needed if it was to be seen at all. Mr. Hart said he thought it would be very effective in offsetting the sometimes barren quality of the Mall.

There was a brief discussion of the possiblity of lighting the sculpture, which will be investigated, and then Miss Wolf asked to comment on the design of the pavilion. She said that from the rendering it appeared to be dated, not related to current architectural thinking, and asked if it could be restudied. Mr. Porterfield and Mr. Giegengack thought the rendering did not do it justice, and it was noted that when it was first designed (with strong Art Nouveau overtones) it was years ahead of its time. The Chairman recalled that the first submission was a classic Miesian box, and the Commission had asked for something closer to a pavilion and more suitable to a garden setting. He said he thought this design had weathered very well, although he knew it might not please everybody. Miss Wolf said she had not seen other drawings and was probably prejudiced by the rendering. The Chairman asked for a decision on the garden concept design and the revised design for the restaurant pavilion; both were unanimously approved. Exhibit K

(The order on the printed agenda was changed, and the last submission from the National Park Service reviewed next.)

3. CFA 12/JUN/86-11, Connecticut Avenue at N Street, N. W. Design for relandscaping of the John Witherspoon Memorial. Mr. Carson told the members that this statue had been erected in 1909 and that over the years, the triangular plot on which it was placed had been rather drastically reduced in size because of street widening. He said the Park Service had new plans for relandscaping it and asked John Parsons to explain them. Mr. Parsons turned the presentation over to their staff landscape architect, Dorothea Roise. Ms. Roise reviewed Witherspoon's career as a leader of the Presbyterian Church, president of the College of New Jersey, now Princeton University, signer of the Declaration of Independence, and advocate of the ratification of the Constitution. Then she showed drawings of the proposal: a low retaining wall near the curb, a low evergreen hedge inside, and for color, perennials planted in front of the statue. Mr. Porterfield asked about maintenance, noting the Park Service's lack of funds to maintain elaborate landscaping on their many small pieces of turf; he suggested planting something that would withstand neglect. Ms. Roise said that several individuals in the area had agreed to pay for the rehabilitation and possibly for maintenance, but she said she agreed with Mr. Porterfield's comment.

(At this point both the Chairman and Senator Goodman had to leave the meeting for other appointments and did not return. The gavel was turned over to Mr. Porterfield.)

Mr. Porterfield asked if there were any further comments. Mr. Hart said he thought the project was worth approving and would not be neglected. The other members agreed and it was unanimously approved. Exhibit L

2. CFA 12/JUN/86-8, Constitution Avenue at Henry Bacon Drive, N. W. Alteration to area between walkway and base of Wall at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Mr. Carson recalled that although the walkway had been enlarged to accommodate the unexpectedly large number of visitors to the memorial, there was still a strip of grass 12" - 18" wide between it and the Wall. However, he said that the black granite caused a build-up of heat which had made the grass impossible to maintain. He introduced John Parsons from the Park Service to discuss the problem. Mr. Parsons showed a videotape of the condition of the grass and the difficulty of watering it with visitors present. He said the problem had been compounded by the recent popularity of taking rubbings from the wall, which caused further wear and tear on the grass. He said the Park Service would like to continue the cobblestone section of the walk right up to the wall, with grass planted between the cobbles. In answer to a question from Miss Wolf, he said it would still be possible to insert small flags or flower holders into the spaces between the stones. All agreed that this was the only practical solution that was aesthetically acceptable, and it was unanimously approved. Exhibit M

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

IV. INSPECTION

Freer Gallery, review of proposed acquisitions. The members left for the Freer Gallery where they inspected the objects proposed for acquisition and approved them. Exhibit N

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

The Metropolitan Museum of Art

EXHIBIT A

Fifth Avenue at 82nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10028 212-TR 9-5500

June 10, 1986

The Honorable J. Carter Brown
Commission of Fine Arts
708 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Mr. Brown:

I have followed with interest the current debate regarding the new design for the United States coins. As curator of American sculpture at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and having just helped organize the Augustus-Saint Gaudens exhibition at the Metropolitan, I have tremendous respect for the beautiful coins that Saint-Gaudens designed at the turn of the century. Largely because of the success of Saint-Gaudens's coins, other notable sculptors including Victor David Brenner (1909 cent), James Earle Fraser (1913 nickel), Adolph Alexander Weinman (1916 dime and half dollar), and Hermon Atkins MacNeil (1916 quarter) were commissioned to design their respective coins. These coins remain among the finest numismatic designs of this century. Because of the beauty of these coins, I would support their continued use or their reissue. If a new design is desired, I hope the present Commission will have the same foresight as the Commission had at the turn of the century, and will again engage some of the most notable living artists to design interesting new coins. These new designs should be the highest reflection of our age and not just the adaptation or stylization of the designs of Saint-Gaudens and his contemporaries.

There is a great opportunity now to aspire to and to realize new heights in numismatic design in the United States--a creative level that was first reached in this country at the turn of the century.

Sincerely yours,

Lewis I. Sharp
Curator and Administrator
of The American Wing

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT A-1

July 11, 1986

Dear Mrs. Pope:

It was a pleasure to talk with you, Mr. Rogers and Mr. Bateman at the Commission's meeting on 12 June and to review the designs for the new gold and silver bullion coins.

The Commission gave its approval to all the designs, noting, however, that when basing designs on previous work, great care should be taken with faithfulness to the original, and that, as a matter of principle one could wish to see new work treated by our best contemporary artists. The members strongly recommended that in the future, competitions be held for the design of all coins and medals of such major significance.

Mr. Rogers's report that the Treasury Department was considering the formation of a committee to improve the design of coins and medals was encouraging. The Commission of Fine Arts would welcome the opportunity to assist in the work of such a group in any way the Secretary might suggest.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable Donna Pope
Director of the Mint
Department of the Treasury
U. S. Mint
Washington, D. C. 20220

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT A-2

July 11, 1986

Dear Mr. Rogers:

The Commission very much appreciated your attendance at our meeting on 12 June when the bullion coin designs and the process by which the Commission reviews such proposals were discussed. It is heartening to know first hand that you share our commitment to the quality of the Mint's coins and medals. Your suggestion that a special committee be established that would focus on design issues seems to us an excellent idea, and I want to assure you that we would be delighted to support its activities in any way you think would be appropriate, either through membership on the committee or through joint meetings between our respective groups.

I believe the foremost interest of this Commission is to ensure wider participation by American sculptors in the design process. To do this, of course, would require sufficient time to solicit, develop and review future designs, and this always seems to be the one ingredient that is in shortest supply. So often authorizing legislation is long in being enacted, yet once done the expectation is that the coins or medals will be produced in the shortest possible time thereafter. Allowing more time for design and production would be a matter worth discussing with the Congressional committees involved. Historically, we know that coins and medals are one of the more lasting forms of art, and it is regrettable that quality of design must suffer at the hands of over-expeditious scheduling.

Again, let me thank you for joining us on the 12th and for contributing your forthright observations and comments. The Commission looks forward to working with you in every way possible to further the Treasury Department's coin and medal program.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. John F. W. Rogers
Assistant Secretary
of the Treasury (Management)
U. S. Department of Treasury
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT A-3

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 22, 1986

Dear John:

You will remember that at our last meeting of the Commission, we had expected to hear from the Executive Director of the Society of Medalists, but he was unable at the last minute to be with us.

I have now received the attached letter, which is quite relevant to our discussions.

With renewed thanks for your personal interest in this matter, and all good wishes,

As ever,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
John F. W. Rogers
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury
for Management
Department of the Treasury
15th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20220

Enclosure

THE SOCIETY OF MEDALISTS

Old Ridgebury Rd., Danbury Ct. 06810 *(203) 792-3000*

EXHIBIT A-4

JOSEPH VEACH NOBLE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

July 1, 1986

JUL 11

Mr. Carter Brown
Chairman
Fine Arts Commission
708 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Carter:

As you can see from the letterhead, I have exchanged my museum director's hat, after my retirement from the Museum of the City of New York, for the hat of the director of another not-for-profit arts organization. Actually, over recent years, I have commissioned a good number of medals for various organizations including Brookgreen Gardens of American Sculpture.

The purpose of this letter is to comment on the problems of the medal and coin design by the U.S. Mint. You know and I know that they are just so-so, not too good but not too bad. I feel that it was regrettable that the Saint-Gaudens design was used again, perticularly in a "modernized" form. You certainly would not permit that with any painting in The National Gallery of Art. There is no point in just complaining. What can be done to help improve the situation?

The answer is to hold limited competitions, and to involve some of America's fine sculptors. There are good medalists out there, as I have found in the creation of imaginative art medals for The Society of Medalists. From what I heard about the most recent meeting of the Fine Arts Commission, I believe the Treasury Department is ready for such a move. I think the stumbling block is the very short time from Congressional authorization of a medal or coin to the time it is to be distributed. That is not fair to the Mint, but there it is.

It seems to me that the Mint staff needs some seed money to get projects started before Congress finally appropriates the official money. Sure, some of the seed money may be wasted on projects that are not ultimately approved, but on the ones that are approved the seed fund could be reimbursed as a revolving fund. To do this may call for the formation of the Friends of the Mint, a private sector organization to raise the seed money.

We both know that there is the precedent for this in the many ways the private sector helps the Smithsonian as well as the National Parks. So you see, I am trying to cut the Gordian knot because

quality requires limited competitions, and they require time, and time is in short supply.

Let's see if there is some way we can improve the quality of the output of the U.S. Mint.

Best personal wishes,

Cordially yours,

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT A-5

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 22, 1986

Dear Joe:

I am delighted to have your good letter on the question of U.S. medal and coin design.

Your thoughts are most interesting, and your letter will be passed on to the relevant authorities.

As you know, our Commission is only advisory, but I sense a new interest at the Treasury in improving the U.S. record, and I am very hopeful that we shall be seeing positive results.

With every good wish,

As ever,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Joseph Veach Noble
Executive Director
The Society of Medalists
Old Ridgebury Road
Danbury, Connecticut 06810

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT A-6

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 24, 1986

Dear John:

Here are two more letters that relate to our recent discussions.

With continuing thanks for your interest, and all best,

As ever,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
John F. W. Rogers
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury
for Management
Department of the Treasury
15th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20220

Enclosure

c: CFA.

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
JL 1

NATIONAL SCULPTURE SOCIETY

Founded in 1893

EXHIBIT A-7

June 18, 1986

Mr. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Federal Commission of Fine Arts
708 Jackson Place, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Mr. Brown:

In closing the first part of the agenda of the Commission's meeting on June 12th you said that the Minutes of the meeting would be kept open so that statements by those who had not spoken on the coin design under consideration could do so. I am availing myself of that invitation.

Most of the discussion that I heard concerned a new design and corrections for the Augustus Saint-Gaudens double eagle gold coin of 1907: a figure trimming (weight watching?) for the Liberty figure on the obverse and a completely new design to replace Saint-Gaudens reverse side.

I realize that the coin and its design are the property of the Federal Government and that, as such, they have a legal right to make any changes that are deemed desirable. However, I do believe that with a coin of this stature, the work of one of America's greatest sculptors, and a coin of great popular appeal as well as a part of our national heritage, there is a moral obligation on the part of the government to preserve it as the sculptor created it.

To make any changes, no matter how slight, is to destroy it.

To make that point clear, consider this: suppose that the mint, instead of striking a new coin, was pressing a new recording of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony. For economy's sake or a misguided attempt to give the work new appeal, it is decided to drop the last movement, the Choral, and replace it with something shorter. So the last movement of Beethoven's Seventh Symphony is substituted and the ninth's original first three movements trimmed and cut to give them greater appeal.

Can you imagine the outcry when this 'new and improved' Ninth Symphony is offered to the public? Whimsical as this is, in actuality it is not so different from what is being proposed for the Saint-Gaudens coin.

15 East 26 Street New York, NY 10010 212-889-6960

There may be valid reasons for not striking a new issue of the coin. In that case why consider using it at all, 'improved' or not? Why not issue an entirely new coin? Saint-Gaudens designed the double eagle at the invitation of President Theodore Roosevelt who wanted to improve the quality of U.S. coins. To do this he turned to the best sculptor of this day...and received in return a remarkable coin and a work of art which became an historic milepost and bright example of the growth of American culture.

The same possibility exists today. There are any number of living American sculptors who can produce a brilliant coin if given the opportunity.

My suggestion is to hold a national competition for new coin designs. This nation, rich in talent, is capable of producing a coinage worthy of the country. While the nation is noted world-wide for its power, wealth and inventiveness, the same cannot be said for its culture. Here is an opportunity to show what Americans can do artistically.

We would not have the Saint-Gaudens coin now if a far-seeing native American statesman had not had the courage to give American arts a chance.

Sincerely,

Fritz Cleary

Fritz Cleary
President

NATIONAL SCULPTURE SOCIETY

15 EAST 26TH STREET • NEW YORK, N. Y. 10010 • (212) 889-6960

DONALD DE LUE
HONORARY PRESIDENT

FRITZ CLEARY
PRESIDENT

MARCEL JOVINE
1ST VICE PRESIDENT

JOSEPH BRESNAN
2ND VICE PRESIDENT

CARLETON D. BURTT
TREASURER

MARION ROLLER
SECRETARY

EDWARD FENNO HOFFMAN, III
RECORDING SECRETARY

COUNCIL
STANLEY BLEIFELD
PETER COZZOLINO
CHARLOTTE DUNWIDDIE
DOMENICO FACCI
LEONDA FINKE
BARBARA LEKBERG
ISIDORE MARGULIES
DONALD R. MILLER
PETER MULLER
CHARLES PARKS
J. WALTER ROTH
SEIJI SAITO
JOHN TERKEN
EDWIN THATCHER
ALBERT WEIN
BARRY WEINER
ROBERT A. WEINMAN
JUDITH WELLER

LEGAL ADVISOR
ERIC MALM

ADVISORS TO THE COUNCIL
DAVID FINN
WALTER JOSIAH
JOSEPH VEACH NOBLE

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
CLAIRE A. STEIN

ADVISORY BOARD
OF PAST PRESIDENTS
DONALD DE LUE
ADLAI S. HARDIN
FRANK ELISCU
MICHAEL LANTZ
ROBERT A. WEINMAN
CHARLES PARKS
GRANVILLE W CARTER
CHARLOTTE DUNWIDDIE

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE ART COMMISSION AND THE MINT

U.S. coins designed by National Sculpture Society members:

1907 - Augustus Saint-Gaudens
$10 and $20 gold pieces
1908 - Bela Lyon Pratt
$5 and $2½ gold pieces
1909 - Victor Brenner
Lincoln cent
1913 - James Earle Fraser
Buffalo nickel
1915 - Charles Keck
Gold dollar
1916 - Adolph A. Weinman
Liberty half dollar
Mercury dime
1922 - Anthony de Francisci
Peace dollar
1932 - John Flanagan
Washington quarter
? - John Sinnock
Roosevelt dime
? - Gilroy Roberts
Kennedy half dollar

Famous commemoratives and medals have been done by Laura Gardin Fraser, Henry Kreis, Paul Manship, Henry Augustus Lukeman, Chester Beach, Gutson Borglum, Cyrus Dallin, Jacques Schnier, Carl Schmitz, and many other Society members.

The age old cry against artistry is "they will not stack in equal piles". We must fight the good fight for beautiful American coinage in each generation.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT A-8

July 25, 1986

Dear Mr. Cleary:

I am happy to make your recent letter a part of the record of our meeting on June 12, 1986 when we discussed the designs for the new bullion coins. As I am sure you have read by now, the Commission approved the designs, but I must add, the action was taken with a distinct lack of enthusiasm. We strongly share your feelings on both the limitations and questions raised in the remaking of previously circulated designs.

I believe that some hope may be justified in the expressed intentions of Treasury of making a renewed effort to secure better coin and medal designs. To this end they are establishing a new group within the Department that will focus solely on this issue, and we wish them well.

In the meantime your feelings and those of the many other sculptors represented by the Society should be made known to Mr. Annunzio's committee on the Hill. They can ultimately determine many of the issues surrounding the designs of the coins and medals they authorize simply by making certain conditions, such as the need for competitions, a part of the legislation.

While I know from experience that individual artists are often not inclined to an interest in the legislative process, the National Sculpture Society, on the other hand, might be able to make a difference.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Secretary

Mr. Fritz Cleary
President
National Sculpture Society
15 East 26 Street
New York, New York 10010

The Newark Museum

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

EXHIBIT A-9

June 19, 1986

Mr. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
U.S. Government Fine Arts Commission
708 Jackson Place N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Carter:

We commend the Commission's recommendations toward totally new and improved designs for all United States coins, in particular the proposed gold and silver bullion pieces.

As one of New Jersey's foremost educational institutions, The Newark Museum has the only comprehensive, public Coin Collection in the State. The scope of our collecting includes United States and foreign issues, and the quality of the Collection is known internationally.

In using the Collection, we fully recognize that these objects are a most effective means of teaching history, business, finance and other areas not dealt with by any other collection. In particular, we see this field as a way of encouraging good design, attracting a wide and diverse audience difficult to reach by any other medium.

Bullion pieces and other coins should represent our nation'a artistic taste because they circulate in world markets, in competition with those of other countries. Their designs deserve to be representative of the best talents currently available.

We therefore strongly support your policy of advocating for more serious attention, especially by the U.S. Treasury, to the artistic quality of our numismatic issues.

Yours very truly,

Samuel C. Miller
Director

:rb

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT A-10

July 25, 1986

Dear Sam:

Many thanks for your letter supporting our views on the need for new and better designs for coins and medals issued by the U. S. Mint. We are confident that there are many artists today who could make a contribution to our government's numismatic arts if only given the chance. Unfortunately, the majority of designs is produced in-house by the Mint, or, as in the case of the bullion coins, older designs are resurrected from the past.

You might be interested to know that Assistant Secretary of the Treasury John Rogers attended our last meeting when this very subject was discussed at some length. He indicated that the Treasury Department was indeed interested in improving the quality of design, and toward this end was planning to establish a special committee within the Department that would address this issue.

Let us hope that some measurable improvements will result from their efforts.

With all best wishes,

As ever,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Samuel C. Miller
Director
The Newark Museum
49 Washington Street
P. O. Box 540
Newark, New Jersey 07101

Public Law 99-185
99th Congress

An Act

To authorize the minting of gold bullion coins.

Dec. 17, 1985
[S. 1639]

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Gold Bullion Coin Act of 1985.
31 USC 5101 note.

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Gold Bullion Coin Act of 1985".

MINTING GOLD BULLION COINS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 5112(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(7) A fifty dollar gold coin that is 32.7 millimeters in diameter, weighs 33.931 grams, and contains one troy ounce of fine gold.

"(8) A twenty-five dollar gold coin that is 27.0 millimeters in diameter, weighs 16.966 grams, and contains one-half troy ounce of fine gold.

"(9) A ten dollar gold coin that is 22.0 millimeters in diameter, weighs 8.483 grams, and contains one-fourth troy ounce of fine gold.

"(10) A five dollar gold coin that is 16.5 millimeters in diameter, weighs 3.393 grams, and contains one-tenth troy ounce of fine gold.".

(b) Section 5112 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

Ante, p. 115.

"(i)(1) Notwithstanding section 5111(a)(1) of this title, the Secretary shall mint and issue the gold coins described in paragraphs (7), (8), (9), and (10) of subsection (a) of this section, in quantities sufficient to meet public demand, and such gold coins shall—

31 USC 5111.

"(A) have a design determined by the Secretary, except that the fifty dollar gold coin shall have—

"(i) on the obverse side, a design symbolic of Liberty; and

"(ii) on the reverse side, a design representing a family of eagles, with the male carrying an olive branch and flying above a nest containing a female eagle and hatchlings;

"(B) have inscriptions of the denomination, the weight of the fine gold content, the year of minting or issuance, and the words 'Liberty', 'In God We Trust', 'United States of America', and 'E Pluribus Unum'; and

"(C) have reeded edges.

"(2)(A) The Secretary shall sell the coins minted under this subsection to the public at a price equal to the market value of the bullion at the time of sale, plus the cost of minting, marketing, and distributing such coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and promotional and overhead expenses).

Marketing.

71-139 O - 85 - (185)

"(B) The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins minted under this subsection at a reasonable discount.

"(3) For purposes of section 5132(a)(1) of this title, all coins minted under this subsection shall be considered to be numismatic items.".

(c) Section 5116(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(3) The Secretary shall acquire gold for the coins issued under section 5112(i) of this title by purchase of gold mined from natural deposits in the United States, or in a territory or possession of the United States, within one year after the month in which the ore from which it is derived was mined. The Secretary shall pay not more than the average world price for the gold. In the absence of available supplies of such gold at the average world price, the Secretary may use gold from reserves held by the United States to mint the coins issued under section 5112(i) of this title. The Secretary shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this paragraph.".

Regulations.

(d) Section 5118(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking out "or deliver"; and

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting "(other than gold and silver coins)" before "that may be lawfully held".

(e) The third sentence of section 5132(a)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking out "minted under section 5112(a) of this title" and inserting in lieu thereof "minted under paragraphs (1) through (6) of section 5112(a) of this title".

Ante, p. 116.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an amount equal to the amount by which the proceeds from the sale of the coins issued under section 5112(i) of title 31, United States Code, exceed the sum of—

31 USC 5112 note.

(1) the cost of minting, marketing, and distributing such coins, and

Marketing.

(2) the value of gold certificates (not exceeding forty-two and two-ninths dollars a fine troy ounce) retired from the use of gold contained in such coins,

National debt.

shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury and shall be used for the sole purpose of reducing the national debt.

(g) The Secretary shall take all actions necessary to ensure that the issuance of the coins minted under section 5112(i) of title 31, United States Code, shall result in no net cost to the United States Government.

31 USC 5112 note.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect on October 1, 1985, except that no coins may be issued or sold under section 5112(i) of title 31, United States Code, before October 1, 1986. 31 USC 5112 note. *Ante*, p. 1177.

Approved December 17, 1985.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY—S. 1639:

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 131 (1985):
Nov. 14, considered and passed Senate.
Dec. 2, considered and passed House.
WEEKLY COMPILATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS, Vol. 21, No. 51 (1985):
Dec. 17, Presidential statement.

○

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT B

July 11, 1986

Dear Mr. Whitlock:

At its meeting on 12 June the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed revised designs for the Nancy Hanks Memorial Plaque at the Old Post Office.

I am happy to tell you the design was approved.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. James Whitlock
Assistant Regional Administrator
for Public Buildings and Real
Property
General Services Administration
National Capital Region
Washington, D. C. 20407

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT C

July 11, 1986

Dear Mr. Brodie:

This will confirm the Commission's approval on June 12, 1986 of the Lone Sailor statue to be installed on the Navy Memorial Plaza in Market Square.

The Commission's approval was based on photos of the full size clay figure and a report of an inspection of the work recently made by Commission staff at the sculptor's studio in Connecticut.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. M. J. Brodie
Executive Director
Pennsylvania Avenue Development
Corporation
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Suite 1220 North
Washington, D. C. 20004-1703

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT D

July 11, 1986

Dear Mr. Reiss:

The Commission was unable to approve designs for the new Smithsonian Institution sign program at its 12 June 1986 meeting. We support the Smithsonian's efforts to develop an overall identification program and to key the design to the Smithsonian "sunburst" symbol, but recommend additional study. Our chief concerns are the proposed colors, materials and lettering size. A red for the sign and chrome for the post may be too harsh for the area around the Mall while the scale of the lettering could be increased slightly to maximize visibility.

Perhaps most important to the consideration of this project is that it offers an opportunity to establish a pilot sign program suitable for all Federal buildings in the monumental core. The result of such efforts could serve as a guide to other departments and agencies. We will be happy to assist with efforts at interagency coordination and hope you will consider it.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Philip K. Reiss
Director
Office of Design and Construction
Smithsonian Institution
955 L'Enfant Plaza, Room 3230
Washington, D. C. 20560

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT E

July 11, 1986

Dear Mr. Reiss:

The Commission of Fine Arts was happy to meet with you on 12 June 1986 and to approve modifications to the north entrance of the Smithsonian "Castle" building. The proposed walks are in character with the building and complement the approved landscape plans. They also appear to be an improvement on the pedestrian movement into the building while providing a more dignified ramp for handicapped use into the exhibit space. The Commission was pleased to hear that the existing holly trees flanking the tower can be moved and retained without damage.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Philip K. Reiss
Director
Office of Design and Construction
Smithsonian Institution
955 L'Enfant Plaza, Room 3230
Washington, D. C. 20560

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT F

July 11, 1986

Dear Mr. Newell:

The Commission was pleased to meet with you and your architects on 12 June 1986 to discuss concept designs for a federal office building at the International Center. We understand that the building will contain much needed space for the State Department and the Executive Protective Service as well as provide maintenance facilities for the Center.

In reviewing the program requirements and the resulting designs, the members voiced concern over the obvious disparity in scale as compared to the smaller existing and planned chancery buildings to the south and west of the site. This disturbing difference was further aggravated by the somewhat overbearing civic nature of the design itself. As result, the Commission advises that the design is unacceptable.

The Commission believes that the presence of the United States at the International Center should be low-keyed and gracious, providing both a sense of hospitality as well as a discreet formula for fulfilling the actual physical space requirements. Unfortunately, the proposed building in combination with the prominence and elevation of its site is too high and aggressive to achieve this goal. One means of alleviating the problem would be either to locate more of the program requirements below grade or re-evaluate the space needs of each program. In scaling down the size of the structure, careful attention could then be given to the character of the building, with emphasis on reducing the assertiveness of the current scheme.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Michael B. Newell
Director
International Center Project
Deparment of State
State Annex #1, Room W110
Washington, D. C. 20520

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT G

July 11, 1986

Dear Mr. McCormick:

The Commission of Fine Arts met with representatives of the Army Corps of Engineers, Arlington Cemetery, and the architects for the Arlington Visitors Center on 12 June 1986. In giving our approval, we note that design developments for the parking garage and the overall landscape plan will be submitted for Commission review in the near future.

Mr. Lethbridge, the principal architect, presented the design and pointed out a proposal for narrowing and recessing the gateway through the Memorial Drive hedge. We feel that this is an improvement. He also discussed the possibility of replacing the glazed barrel vault with a segmental vault. We feel that would be a step backward and encourage you to proceed with the barrel vault--provided it will not be illuminated at night. We understand that there has been some discussion of the building's height, and reaffirm our feeling that the scale and size of this building are appropriate to the program, location and special public use it will sustain. Further discussion about relocating the building closer to Jefferson Davis Highway would not be appropriate in our view. The building should be treated as a permanent architectural addition to the Cemetery and given a well-landscaped setting with substantial trees. It should not be placed on the edge of the Cemetery bordering the right-of-way of the subway, highway and Memorial Drive as such a location would give it the visibility we would hope to avoid.

We look forward to reviewing further details as they are developed.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William N. McCormick, Jr.
Chief, Engineering Division
Directorate of Engineering
and Construction
Department of the Army
Office of the Chief of Engineers
Washington, D. C. 20314-10000

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT H

July 11, 1986

Dear Mr. McCormick:

The Commission of Fine Arts was happy to meet with Mr. Herb Eichler, of the Corps of Engineers, on 12 June 1986 to discuss plans for renovation of the Ft. McNair Commissary. Retaining and renovating the stable buildings on either side of the new infill structure seems an excellent proposal, with the design of the infill structure being an appropriate complement to the stable buildings. We approve the project as a net improvement to this historic post.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William N. McCormick, Jr.
Chief, Engineering Division
Directorate of Engineering
and Construction
Department of the Army
Office of the Chief of Engineers
Washington, D. C. 20314-10000

AGENDA ITEM EXHIBITS
CFA Meeting 12 June 1986
Old Georgetown and Shipstead-Luce Actions

EXHIBIT I

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-104 HPA. 86-323	1054 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W.	Raze building

ACTION: Recommend against razing of structures on the basis of their contribution to the setting and scale of this unique block-long section of the canal historic district and the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Park.

O.G. 86-110 HPA. 86-336	1054 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W.	New office building - Conceptual

ACTION: Recommend against concept designs as presented on the basis that such additions would alter the scale and historic setting of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and require demolition of the existing building fabric. (See O.G. 86-104.)

O.G. 86-149 HPA. 86-435	907 30th Street, N. W. Rosewood Georgetown Joint Venture	Rosewood Hotel

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed improvements to public space as shown on drawings received and dated 8 May 1986.

O.G. 86- 153 HPA. 86-446	3520 Reservoir Road, N. W. Steven Brown	4-story townhouse

ACTION: No objection to concept designs for pair of houses as shown on drawings received and dated 14 May 1986. Submit working drawings and landscape plan for final review by CFA prior to start of construction. Working drawings should be submitted with letter from applicant either confirming that approved concept design has not been altered or describing those changes intended.

---

12 June 1986

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-154 HPA. 86-446	3525 Reservoir Road, N. W. Scott Stinson	4-story townhouse

ACTION: No objection to concept designs for pair of houses as shown on drawings received and dated 14 May 1986. Submit working drawings and landscape plan for final review by CFA prior to start of construction. Working drawings should be submitted with letter from applicant either confirming that approved concept design has not been altered or describing those changes intended.

O.G. 86-138 HPA. 86-394	1609 33rd Street, N. W. Jagdish Katyal	Garage razing

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for razing of existing one-story, brick garage structure as described in documents received and dated 30 April 1986.

O.G. 86-155 HPA. 86-447	1677-79 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Aramus Corporation	Repairs

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed work visible from public space allowing the replacement of windows and trim to match existing, to repair stucco, and to resurface patches as shown on plans filed with the Commission of Fine Arts and attached hereto. The Commission additionally has no objection to the resurfacing with wood siding a reconstructed six-foot-eight-inch deep addition to the rear of 1675 Wisconsin Avenue, subject to the proper Reconstruction and Repairs permit being issued to the satisfaction of the District of Columbia Government. See case O.G. 86-156.

O.G. 86-156 HPA. 86-448	1675 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Joseph Mobassalef	Alteration and repair

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed work visible from public space allowing the replacement of windows and trim to match existing, to repair stucco, and to resurface patches as shown on plans filed with the Commission of Fine Arts and attached hereto. The Commission additionally has no objection to the resurfacing with wood siding a reconstructed six-foot-eight-inch deep addition to the rear of 1675 Wisconsin Avenue, subject to the proper Reconstruction and Repairs permit being issued to the satisfaction of the District of Columbia Government. See case O.G. 86-155.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-135 HPA. 86-390	1692 31st Street, N. W. Cass and Pennell	Addition: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for addition and alterations as shown on supplemental drawings received and dated 19 May 1986. Working drawings should be submitted with letter from applicant either confirming that approved concept design has not been altered of describing those changes intended.

O.G. 86-152 HPA. 86-443	3530 Water Street, N. W. Potomac Boat Club	Addition and renovation

ACTION: No objection to concept design for addition and renovation of existing boating facility as shown on supplemental drawings received and dated 20 May 1986. Recommend that second floor of addition facing Water Street be recessed and clad in wood shingles instead of brick. Submit working drawings for final review by CFA prior to exterior construction. Working drawings should be submitted with letter from applicant confirming that approved concept design has not been altered or describing those changes intended.

S.L. 86-80 HPA. 86-257	3100 Macomb Street, N. W. Washington International School	New academic building and renovation of greenhouse: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of greenhouse renovation or new classroom building. Note is made that the projects have limited visibility from Rock Creek Park and that the proposed designs are harmonious with the existing school buildings. Working drawings should be submitted with letter from applicant either confirming that approved concept design has not been altered or describing those changes intended. See case S.L. 86-99.

S.L. 86-99 HPA. 86-432	3100 Macomb Street, N. W. Washington International School	New academic building and renovation of greenhouse: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of greenhouse renovation or new classroom building. Note is made that the projects have limited visibility from Rock Creek Park and that the proposed designs are harmonious with the existing school buildings. Working drawings should be submitted with letter from applicant either confirming that approved concept design has not been altered or describing those changes intended. See case S.L. 86-80.

12 June 1986

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-113 HPA. -	750 17th Street, N. W. Manufacturers Life	12-story office building

ACTION: No objection to concept proposal for new office building as shown on drawings received and dated 4 June 1986. While removal of proposed ornamental railing at top of building is advised, recommend retention and continued careful development of ornamental details elsewhere. Working drawings should be submitted with letter from applicant either confirming that approved concept design has not been altered or describing those changes intended.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT I-1

July 11, 1986

Dear Mr. Raiche:

The Commission of Fine Arts is transmitting its recommendations against the razing and construction applications for a project at 1054 Thomas Jefferson Street and 1053 31st Street, Northwest (O.G. 86-104 and 110). This action was taken at our public meeting on 12 June 1986 and further supported by recommendations against the proposals from the Commission's Georgetown Board of Consultants, the ANC, the Citizens Association of Georgetown, and The Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown, Inc.

Our action is based on the contributing value of the buildings to the setting and scale of this unique block-long section of the historic district and its relation to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park. We note that these buildings date from the first part of the 20th century as industrial structures and reflect a layering of changes made up to the 1960's that together contribute to the diverse architectural character and history of the historic district. The Commission feels that such characteristics should be preserved as part of the historic and visual continuity of the area and that the integrity of the historic district would be better served by retaining the existing structures.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Stephen Raiche
Program Manager
Historic Preservation Review Board
614 H Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20001

The Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown

Box 3603 Georgetown Station • Washington, D.C. 20007

June 6, 1986

EXHIBIT J

The Honorable
J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Commission of Fine Arts
708 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Mr. Chairman:

On behalf of the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown, I want to express our appreciation to you and the members of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Old Georgetown Board for your careful deliberations, on-site inspections and patient consideration of community concerns regarding the Historic District of Georgetown. It is gratifying to know that the District of Columbia authorities are viewing your advice and counsel with the same weight and follow-up enforcement.

We also thank you for adopting the Policy on Additions to Houses in Georgetown, dated April 17, 1986. This will be a useful guide to future building.

We enclose four suggestions for your consideration with regard to the time and place of meetings, public notice of meetings, time of submissions, and recording of meetings.

Since I am unable at this time to appear before you myself, our Executive Committee has authorized Mrs. John G. Boyd, a trustee, to explain our views on specific applications brought before you and the Old Georgetown Board, which will reflect our long-standing position that the remaining open space, existing small scale and historic fabric of Old Georgetown be preserved for future generations to enjoy.

With my best wishes to you and the members of the Commission and the members of the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Wynant D. Vanderpool, Jr.

Enclosure

President—WYNANT D. VANDERPOOL, JR.

Trustees

JOHN W. AUCHINCLOSS
MRS. JOHN G. BOYD
THOMAS BRADLEY
MRS. W. GRAHAM CLAYTOR, JR.
NICHOLAS J. COOLIDGE
COL. ROBERT F. EVANS, U.S.A. (RET.)
MRS. CAROLYN AGGER FORTAS
JOHN HAMMOND
MRS. DONALD D. NOTMAN
THOMAS A. PARROTT
HUGH SCOTT
MRS. JOHN F. SIMMONS
MRS. ROBERT B. SMITH, JR.

Vice President
ROCKWOOD H. FOSTER
Secretary
EDWARD TERHUNE MILLER
Treasurer
CHISWELL D. LANGHORNE, JR.

Honorary Trustees
MRS. DAVID K. E. BRUCE
MRS. J. NOEL MACY

Annual support and contributions are tax deductible
Registered under the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act. No. 6-07-508

SUGGESTED CHANGES AND ADDITIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS TO PROCEDURES AND POLICIES AS STATED IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER OF NOVEMBER 21, 1979, VOL. 44, NO. 226.

Under Subpart A of 2102-Meetings and Procedures of the Commission

2102.1 Times and Places of Meetings

"Regular meetings of the Georgetown Board of Architectural Consultants, open to the public, are held monthly on the second Thursday of the month beginning at 9:30 am in its offices at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006 and regular meetings of the Commission, open to the public, are held monthly on the ~~fourth~~ Thursday of the month beginning at 10 o'clock am....."

2102.3 Public Notice of Meetings

"A draft agenda of the Georgetown Board meeting will be available to the public seven(7) working days before the Georgetown Board meeting. Upon official request of the Citizens Association of Georgetown and the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown one(1) copy of said agenda will be mailed to a designated representative of each organization."

Under Subpart B of 2102-Meetings and Procedures of the Commission

2102.10(a) change the second sentence to read as follows:

"In order to assure that a submission will be considered at the next scheduled meeting of the Commission and to have the proper amount of time for possible on-site inspections it should be delivered to the Commission's offices on the 1st of each month, or the first working day thereafter."

Under Subpart A of 2102, I have a change which we believe will help to improve the accuracy of representation before the Old Georgetown Board and the Commission. It also will help the authorities of the District of Columbia in enforcing the advice and counsel of the OGB and the CFA. Other interested parties also will have an immediate record on which to base judgments and actions. Therefore, we urge the Commission to consider adding this sentence to

2102.5 Records and minutes: public inspection

"Each Old Georgetown Board and Commission meeting will be taped. The public may obtain copies of said tapes by supplying a blank tape to the Commission staff and under staff supervision recording the original tape on a machine at the offices of the Commission."

The Commission, by adopting this policy, will be following normal administrative hearing practice. It is true that the Commission will have to purchase a machine to copy the tapes, with the interested party supplying the blank tape for the copying; but surely it is worth it if we can improve the accuracy of presentations to the OGB and the CFA, improve understanding by all parties of the advice and counsel of the OGB and the CFA and facilitate enforcement of same by the appropriate authorities.

The Georgetown community stands behind the Old Georgetown Board and the Commission of Fine Arts. On behalf of the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown, I thank you for consideration of these suggestions.

Sincerely yours,

Wynant D. Vanderpool, Jr.
President

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT K

July 11, 1986

Dear Jack:

The Commission was pleased to meet with John Parsons and David Sherman of your office and representatives of the architects and landscape designers on 12 June 1986 to discuss ongoing plans for the National Sculpture Garden and revised designs for the attendant service pavilion. The Commission has no objection to the concept designs and commends the participants for the care and attention to detail so far established. While the members look forward to review of the working drawings, we also hope that adequate means will be found to achieve the best possible result in every aspect of this important addition to the Mall.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Manus J. Fish
Director
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S. W., Room 336
Washington, D. C. 20240

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT L

July 11, 1986

Dear Jack:

The Commission was pleased to meet with John Parsons and members of your landscape design staff on 12 June 1986 to discuss plans for relandscaping the John Witherspoon Memorial on Connecticut Avenue at N and 18th Streets, N. W. Provided that the new plant material is hardy and as nearly self-maintaining as possible, the Commission has no objection to the proposal.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Manus J. Fish
Director
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S. W., Room 336
Washington, D. C. 20240

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT M

July 11, 1986

Dear Jack:

The Commission was pleased to meet with John Parsons on 12 June 1986 to discuss a possible solution to the current problem of heat build-up affecting the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Having been shown a video-tape of the burnt condition of the grass border between the footlights and walls, the members agree that replacing the grass with an extension of the existing cobblestones would be for the best.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Manus J. Fish
Director
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S. W., Room 336
Washington, D. C. 20242

FREER GALLERY OF ART
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20560

DIRECTOR 357-2103

EXHIBIT N

June 13, 1986

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
JUN 16

Mr. Charles Atherton
Secretary
Commission of Fine Arts
708 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Charles:

Yesterday, in the full heat and humidity of a June afternoon, the members of the Fine Arts Commission came to the Freer Gallery to review the latest group of objects we are considering for acquisition. Carter had to leave the group early and rush to the airport for a flight to Rome. So Neil Porterfield signed the documents for the Fine Arts Commission.

Incidentally, you will note that there is a separate sheet for the Yi dynasty Korean lacquer box. We had to follow that procedure because the box arrived at the Gallery after Bob Adams had given his approval for the other objects. We will show the Korean lacquer box to Bob separately when he can schedule a visit to the Gallery later this summer.

I am grateful to you for arranging to have the members of the Commission come to the Freer.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

Thomas Lawton
Director

TL/mh
Enclosure

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
JUN 16

CENTER FOR ASIAN ART

FREER GALLERY OF ART • ARTHUR M. SACKLER GALLERY

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and the Commission of Fine Arts, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles Lang Freer, have examined the following objects:

Gifts to the Collection:

1 Chinese lacquer; Ch'ing dynasty, 1644-1912; red and black tray; undecorated.

1 Chinese lacquer; Ming-Ch'ing dynasty, 17th century; tray with mother-of-pearl inlay.

1 Chinese handscroll; ink and color on paper; Ch'ing dynasty, 19th century; Views of Pescadores and Taiwan.

1 Chinese pottery; Ch'ing dynasty, 1644-1912; small circular dish with blue-and-white decoration.

1 Chinese wood; Ch'ing dynasty, 19th century; birdcage with 23 accessories.

1 Japanese pottery; Edo period, 17th century; ewer; blue-and-white floral design.

1 Japanese pottery; Momoyama-Edo period, 16th-17th century; Tamba ware jar.

1 Japanese pottery; Edo period, 19th century; square plate; blue-and-white with design of a fish.

1 Persian lacquer; 1153 A.H. (1740-1741 A.D.); pen box; signed by Muhammad Zaman.

Purchases for the Collection:

1 Early Shang dynasty (second millenium B.C.) bronze chüeh.

4 Chinese calligraphy; Ch'ing dynasty; by Wu T'ing-yang (Jan-chih, 1799-1879); Preface of Buddhist Teaching; ink on paper; seal script.

1 Chinese inlaid lacquer tray; Ming dynasty, 16th century.

1 Indian painting; 1765; Mewar (Rajasthani, Rajput) Maharaja Arsi Singh and party in Amar Vilas; colors on paper.

1 Indian painting; early 18th century; Mughal emperor visiting a sage; Rajput; colors and gold on paper.

June 5, 1986

For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

For the Commission of Fine Arts

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
JUN 19

CENTER FOR ASIAN ART

FREER GALLERY OF ART • ARTHUR M. SACKLER GALLERY
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20560

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and the Commission of Fine Arts, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles Lang Freer, have examined the following object:

Purchase for the Collection:

1 Korean lacquer; Yi dynasty, 17th century; box with inlaid mother-of-pearl.

For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

For The Commission of Fine Arts

MEETING:

31 July 1986